

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 4002-3365 8938 10/634,711 08/05/2003 William F. McKay **EXAMINER** 03/17/2006 52196 7590 KRIEG DEVAULT LLP SNOW, BRUCE EDWARD ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 2800 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2709 3738

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/634,711	MCKAY, WILLIAM F.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Bruce E. Snow	3738
eriod fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication a r Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF	PLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 M	ONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS
WHIC - Exten after S - If NO - Failur Any re	HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perie to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stately received by the Office later than three months after the mad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rood will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
tatus			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27	' January 2006.	
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
ispositi	on of Claims		
4)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-14,30 and 32-67</u> is/are pending in	n the application.	
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>3-8,14,34,35,39-4</u>		ndrawn from consideration.
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-2, 9-11, 13, 30, 32, 33, 36-38, 42</u>	<u>2, 44, 45, 55-63</u> is/are rejecte	∍d.
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
pplication	on Papers		
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.	
10) 🔲 -	Γhe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ a	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr		
11) 🔲 -	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
riority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) 🔲 /	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in A	pplication No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	riority documents have been	received in this National Stage
	application from the International Bure		
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a l	ist of the certified copies not	received.
attachment	i(s)	_	
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
) 🛛 Infom	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ r No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/27/06</u> .		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/27/06have been fully considered.

The objection to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter "dumbbell" has been withdrawn; applicant has removed this term from all claims.

Applicant's amendments and arguments overcame the rejection of under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grosse et al (WO 97/23174).

Applicant's arguments overcame the rejection of under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brosnahan, III (5,645,598).

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulrich (DE 19630256) in view of Michelson (6,123,705), it is applicant's position that they have a priority date prior to the Ulrich reference which is not persuasive. All claims are directed to the elected species shown in figure 37. This subject matter was originally present in PCT/US98/26254 having a filing date of 12/10/98 which is the priority date for all claims. Ulrich has a publication date of 1/29/98 which is earlier and is proper prior art. MPEP 715.02(I) state:

SWEARING BEHIND ONE OF A PLURALITY OF COMBINED REFERENCES Applicant may overcome a 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection based on a combination of references by showing completion of the invention by applicant prior to the effective date of any of the references; applicant need not antedate the reference with the earliest filing date. However, as discussed above, applicant's 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit must show possession of either the whole invention as claimed or something falling within the claim(s) prior to the effective date of the reference being antedated; it is not enough merely to show possession of what the reference happens to show if the reference does not teach the basic inventive concept.

Art Unit: 3738

Where a claim has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Reference A in view of Reference B, with the effective date of secondary Reference B being earlier than that of Reference A, the applicant can rely on the teachings of Reference B to show that the differences between what is shown in his or her 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art prior

to the date of Reference A. <u>However, the 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must still</u> <u>establish possession of **the claimed invention**, not just what Reference A shows, if Reference A does not teach the basic inventive concept.</u>

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 43, 66, 67 are allowed.

Claims 12, 46, 47 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 9-11, 13, 30, 32, 33, 36-38, 42, 44, 45, 55-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulrich (DE 19630256) in view of Michelson (6,123,705).

Ulrich teaches a first cylindrical fusion device being dumbbell shaped including a opposing end pieces 17, 18 and a central element 19 connecting said opposing end pieces. However, Ulrich fails to teach nesting a second dumbbell fusion device with the

Application/Control Number: 10/634,711 Page 4

Art Unit: 3738

tilizing a cutout region; see at least figure 25, elements 406, 408; and figure 43, concave cutout region 902. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have utilized the teachings of Michelson of nesting two fusion device together with the fusion devices of Ulrich because "two cylindrical implant considered to be the preferred number as it is a much more stable construct and has more surface area that a single implant placed centrally (column 2, lines 18-20)" and to include a cutout region "when it is desirable to insert two implants side-by-side into cylindrically prepared channels, and where the height of the disc space between two adjacent vertebra is so great relative to the transverse width of the spine" such that two implant fit within the transverse width (column 3, lines 40 et seq.).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E. Snow whose telephone number is (571) 272-4759. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/634,711 Page 5

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bes

BRUCE SNOW PRIMARY EXAMINER